

ORIGINAL
Bob Stump



0000142701

E-01933A-12-0296

From: Cassandra Wensel & Mike Kanne <casandmike@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 11:19 AM
To: Pierce-Web; BitterSmith-Web; Burns-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: Re: Chairman Stump's Reply to Save Solar Incentives

Dear Chairman Stump,

Respectfully, what I believe the commission did last week, as I stated in my opening sentence, was to reduce incentives for residential rooftop solar installations that generate electricity or heat water. I don't know a single person in our community who is not willing to pay \$2.40 annually to keep the incentive right where it is at and insure an economically prosperous and environmentally sustainable future for Arizona. Additionally, you cut out all commercial solar funding for 2013. Who exactly do you think are going to be able to service and warranty the existing systems when local installers and technicians are put out of business by this ACC decision? Why did you bother to try to help build a beneficial industry in our state if your plan all along was undercut the taxpayers investment as soon as it got on track? Every Arizona tax dollar spent on solar, brings multiple dollars back to the state through federal tax credits. Incentives for solar maintain an extremely important and still growing sector of the economy, including my husband's job as a solar thermal installer. You and I can disagree on how catastrophically destructive this decision is, but that doesn't change the fact that is a bad decision for Arizona, for my community and for my family.

Sincerely,
Cassandra Wensel-Kanne
Tucson, AZ.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

FEB - 5 2013

DOCKETED BY	<i>mm</i>
-------------	-----------

Dear Ms. Wensel-Kanne:

Thanks for your note. I'd be curious to know more about what you believe the Commission did last week. Unfortunately, the media doesn't always do the best job reporting the facts, nor do agenda-driven special interest groups of any stripe. Our children's future is not being "destroyed."

I was proud to be a member of the Commission that enabled more Arizonans to procure more solar, at a lower cost, than ever before in our state's history. The Solar Energy Industries Association said last year was an "unprecedented, banner year for solar installations." Arizona also added more residential solar in 2012 than in the past three years combined. I believe Arizona is on a path to procuring lower-cost solar for Arizona ratepayers.

Again, thanks.

Bob Stump

From: Cassandra Wensel & Mike Kanne [mailto:casandmike@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2013 12:43 PM
To: Pierce-Web; BitterSmith-Web; Burns-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: Save Solar Incentives

Chairman Gary Pierce,
Commissioner Susan Bitter Smith,

RECEIVED
2013 FEB - 5 A 11: 32
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Commissioner Brenda Burns,
Chairman Bob Stump,
Commissioner Bob Burns.

I am horrified and sickened by the Arizona Corporation Commission's decision to reduce incentives for residential rooftop solar installations that generate electricity or heat water. As a taxpayer, I am infuriated at the audacity of completely destroying the investment that we have made in our solar industry, small businesses in our communities, the training of individual tax paying professionals in a livable wage field and in Arizona's entire economic future. As a citizen, I am disgusted by elected officials who said they "would do nothing to harm the solar industry in our state" making it one of their first acts to comprehensively gut the funding that was barely keeping regulated utility companies on track to meet the mandate, required by voters, to boost their use of renewables to 15 percent by 2025. As a parent, I am enraged that you would dare to compromise the health and well being of the environment that we need to protect for future generations by not supporting sustainable, renewable energy sources that do not use our precious commodities of water in order to create energy. As a member of a family whose sole income comes from my husband's work as a solar thermal installer, I am terrified that this decision will threaten our ability to provide for our family.

This is a horrible decision for Arizona. We have an opportunity to be an industry leader nationwide simply by continuing to support the singular growing industry in our state. What could possibly be the motivation for something this short sighted? You will be taking professionals, which our tax dollars contributed to training, and putting them out of work and either onto Arizona unemployment or into other states to work. In just a few short years, when sustainable forms of energy will be the only energy available on the planet, we will have to buy back these technicians at a massively multiplied rate. In contrast, if you were to continue incentivizing solar, we could create a thriving Arizona economy where people would pay to study solar here and train in solar energy, people would pay to move their companies here because they can power them cheaply and tourists would pay to visit and explore our pristine and thriving environment that would be uncontaminated by the damaging extraction of fossil fuels. We can lower the cost of facilities for public offices, schools and libraries by powering them with solar and use those funds to improve programs and education.

Not supporting solar in our state is a path to economic and environmental ruin. It is so fiscally, ecologically, civically and morally irresponsible and such a huge waste of Arizona's resources at every level that this decision has to be overturned. When you weigh the infinite beneficial possibilities of supporting solar against the gray, polluted, desolated, unlivable alternative; how can ever look into the eyes of any child living in this state and justify the decision to destroy their future? Reconsider, the fate of Arizona and our children's future depends upon it.

Sincerely,
Cassandra Wensel-Kanne
Tucson, AZ.

Trisha A. Morgan

From: Sarah King ~~cc: [REDACTED]~~
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 2:05 PM
To: Trisha A. Morgan
Subject: Arizona Renewable Energy Standard

Thank you for your willingness to transmit my concerns to the Corporation Commissioners.

I am Chairperson of the Arizona Ecumenical Council Earth Care Commission. As people of faith, we believe that stewardship of our earth is one of the things that God has called us to do, and we are very active in promoting conservation and energy efficiency efforts. Renewable energy sources such as wind and solar power will cut down on the carbon emissions that are causing great harm to the planet and all of its living creatures. In Arizona, we are blessed with a rich source of renewable energy--the sun--and instead of cutting back on utilization of this resource, we should be LEADING THE EFFORT to promote its use by developing newer and better solar technologies. We respectfully ask that you DO NOT DECREASE the Arizona Renewable Energy Standard. We want a healthy future for our children, grandchildren and all of the creatures that share this planet with us. We can accomplish this, but we need creative and innovative leadership from our elected officials such as the Arizona Corporation Commission to make it happen.

Respectfully,

Sarah King
Chair
Arizona Ecumenical Council Earth Care Commission

Trisha A. Morgan

From: Tabot Tietjen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 5:01 PM
To: Pierce-Web
Cc: Burns-Web; Stump-Web; BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: Residential solar incentive

Hi,

I wanted to write to let you know how disappointed I am with your decision to lower the Residential solar incentive to 10 cents per watt. You misled the voters by saying that you would support solar. I hope you keep your promise to voters and raise the incentive to a more fair and reasonable level of incentive when you vote again.

Thanks for your time,
Tabot Tietjen

Trisha A. Morgan

From: Leslie epperson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2013 10:45 AM
To: Stump-Web
Subject: Angry at your decision

Dear Mr. Stump,

I am disappointed and angry at the cutting of incentives for solar energy use by TEP and for home owners. This is a short sighted decision on your part and the rest of the commissioners and it will only make trying to find sustainable energy solutions for ourselves and the generations to come that much harder.

Once again, the ACC acts to please those with profit driven motives instead of the needs of the people of Southern Arizona.

Shame on you!

Leslie Ann Epperson,

[REDACTED]
Tucson, AZ 85719

Bob Stump

From: jedtaz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2013 1:39 PM
To: Stump-Web; Burns-Web; Pierce-Web; BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: Reconsider renewable energy standards mandate

Dear Commissioner

I ask you to reconsider the Renewable Energy Standard and Tariff (REST) and repeal this mandate for the reasons listed below.

I realize that this request is perhaps untenable in the current political climate, so I also propose an alternative: freeze the mandate requirements at currently attained levels until the unemployment rate in Arizona drops below 3 percent.

Reasons to repeal Renewable Energy Standard and Tariff:

1. Electricity generated from renewable sources is much more expensive than conventional generation. That expense is reflected in higher electricity bills. For instance, my bill from Tucson Electric Power itemizes an expense for "Renewable Energy Standard Tariff" and another charge for "DSM Surcharge." In 2011, TEP raised about \$35 million from these charges. It is estimated that from 2010 to 2025, the surcharges for electricity from REST will cost consumers \$1.2 billion more than they would have paid for conventional energy sources.

The cost of being politically correct is essentially a regressive tax which will cause low income households to shoulder a greater burden than higher income households because the energy costs make up a larger portion of their budget. Higher electricity costs also limit the ability of businesses to expand and hire more people. Higher costs equal fewer jobs.

2. Renewable energy sources such as wind and solar are intermittent, unpredictable, and unreliable. Increased generation from unreliable sources will make our electric grid less secure and more susceptible to blackouts and brownouts. Solar and wind generation typically produce at only about 20% of rated generation capacity. For instance, Tucson Electric Power operates one of the largest solar PV arrays in the United States, a 5-MW system. But during five years of operation it has produced at only 19% of its rated capacity. Even in Arizona, clouds cause rapid fluctuation in the array's power output.

3. Because generation from renewable energy sources is intermittent and unpredictable, these sources require backup generation which is usually by burning fossil fuels. Because the time and duration for backup generation need is unpredictable, the fossil-fuel fired backup generators cannot be run efficiently. Experience in Europe shows that backup generators actually use more fuel and produce more carbon dioxide emissions and pollutants such as sulfur dioxide than they normally would if they were run efficiently for primary generation.

A new report from the European Nuclear Energy Agency analyzed the effects erratic intermittent source generation on the electric grid: The report considers "six technologies in detail: nuclear, coal, gas, onshore wind, offshore wind and solar. It finds that the so-called dispatchable technologies - coal, gas and nuclear - have system costs of less than \$3 per MWh, while the system costs for renewables can reach up to \$40 per MWh for onshore wind, \$45 per MWh for offshore wind and \$80 per MWh for solar. The costs for renewables vary depending on the country, technology and penetration levels, **with higher system costs for greater penetration of renewables.**

4. Use of renewable energy will not impact climate. By using data from the Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, NOAA, and the IPCC, it is possible to estimate the temperature impact of carbon dioxide emissions. For instance, if we stopped all U.S. carbon dioxide emissions it could theoretically prevent a temperature rise of 0.08 C by 2050. If Arizona stopped all carbon dioxide emissions it could theoretically prevent a temperature rise of 0.0015 C by 2050. Will you notice? (Data from Science & Public Policy Institute report "Analysis of US and State-by-State Carbon Dioxide Emissions & Potential 'Savings' in Future Global Temperature & Global Sea Level Rise")

Besides, the increasing emissions from other countries such as China will completely wipe out any imagined savings from REST.

5. Renewable energy generation is not as green as advertized. Many PV solar panels rely on polysilicon being manufactured in large quantities and at high quality. A byproduct of polysilicon production is silicon tetrachloride, a highly toxic substance that poses a major environmental hazard. Wherever silicon tetrachloride is dumped, the land becomes totally infertile. A major environmental cost of photovoltaic solar energy is toxic chemical pollution (arsenic, gallium, and cadmium) and energy consumption associated with the large-scale manufacture of photovoltaic panels.

A Cato report found that the materials required for thermal-solar projects were 1,000 times greater than for a similarly sized fossil-fuel facility, creating substantial incremental energy consumption and industrial pollution.

A wind farm uses about 85 times the area required by a gas-fired plant, about 10 to 80 acres per megawatt capacity. Solar requires about 10 acres per megawatt, still much larger than fossil fuel plants. This large footprint may impact wildlife.

Besides chopping up birds, a study from M.I.T. says wind turbines cause a rise in local temperatures of up to 1.8 F because the turbines disrupt local air flow that can transport heat away from the land surface.

6. Wind turbines cause human health problems due to low frequency vibrations. Wind turbine syndrome is alleged to cause dizziness; increased blood pressure, sleeplessness, and depression among other things. In December, 2011, in a peer-reviewed report in the Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, Dr. Carl Phillips, one of the U.S.'s most distinguished epidemiologists, concluded that there is "overwhelming evidence that wind turbines cause serious health problems in nearby residents, usually stress-disorder type diseases, at a nontrivial rate."

My argument here is not against any use of renewable energy because there may be circumstances where such use is appropriate. My argument is against government mandated use which raises our electricity rates unnecessarily, distorts the market, and makes our electric grid less reliable.

Renewable energy mandates are bad for ratepayers, bad for the environment, and even bad for the state's economy because of the increased electrical costs on business and the expense of government subsidies required by the mandate.

Please repeal or at least cut back the renewable energy standards mandate.

Additional information is available on my Tucson Citizen blog:

<http://tucsoncitizen.com/wryheat/2012/12/11/petition-to-arizona-legislature-dump-renewable-energy-mandates/>

Jonathan DuHamel

[REDACTED]

Tucson, AZ 85745

[REDACTED]

Trisha A. Morgan

From: Josephine Thomason <josephine.thomason@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 26, 2013 3:19 PM
To: Stump-Web
Subject: Solar

As an elected official I believe it is your job to do what I'd best for the community. I do not understand how cutting funding to the only growing part of our economy counts as beneficial to the community. It is my understanding that since you made this decision solar companies are having to lay people off. That took less than a week. Whatever your motivation is it is clearly not the interest of this state or its people.

Please change your mind,

Josephine Thomason

Trisha A. Morgan

From: John Neville [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 26, 2013 3:52 PM
To: Stump-Web; Pierce-Web; Burns-Web; BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: Dissappointed

Commissioners:

Your decision to cut incentives for commercial solar energy and for residential systems will not help Arizona energy users and will directly harm Arizona taxpayers and our economy. You are violating your mission, and most Arizonans would like to know why.

By cutting solar incentives, you save ratepayers pennies each month while dealing a harsh blow to an industry that we need for our economy. Your acceptance of the new utility rates will cost schools and taxpayers millions of dollars – just because the schools chose clean, renewable solar energy instead of polluting fossil fuels to run their operations. How is that good for our economy?

Arizona was just beginning to be competitive in solar energy (when we should have been leaders), and you try to kill the industry. Why? It makes no sense unless there is something we don't know about your relationship with the fossil fuel industry. Please explain.

John Neville
[REDACTED] Sedona, AZ 86336
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]